

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed December 3, 2004. Claims 1, 3-23, 28-40, and 43-45 were pending in the application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 22, 23, 28, 33, 38, 40, and 45 and canceled claim 9. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-8, 10-23, 28-40, and 43-45 remain pending in the application.

The Office Action objected to claims 14, 15, 33, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (second paragraph) due to use of the term “Java.” Applicant has amended claims 14, 15, and 33 to remove the term “Java.” The objection is thus believed moot.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-13, 15-23, 28-32, 34-40, and 43-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parthasarathy, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,347,398) (hereinafter “Parthasarathy”) in view of Chatterji (U.S. Pat. No. 5,664,195). The Office Action rejected claims 14 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parthasarathy in view of Chatterji and further in view of Dale, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,049,664) (hereinafter “Dale”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Parthasarathy describes a method for automatically obtaining on a local computer a computer software component from one or more remote computers. As is acknowledged in the Office Action, Parthasarathy does not disclose the features of claim 9 (now canceled): “wherein the user processing apparatus is configured to install the components so that the components are isolated from each other and to permit operational interaction between the components in accordance with defined interaction rules.” The independent claims, including claim 1, have been amended to incorporate the features previously included in claim 9 (now canceled). Support for the amendments may also be found in the description at page 3, line 26, to page 4, line 10. As is indicated at page 3, line 26 to page 4, line 5, the isolation of the components provides security for the system.

Furthermore, Parthasarathy does not teach or suggest arranging and testing the components to verify their authenticity and/or to verify the defined interaction rules. The arranging and testing of the components provides an additional level of security in accordance with which the authenticity of the components is tested and/or the defined interaction rules are verified.

Chatterji describes a system and method for dynamic installation of a driver on a computer system. As illustrated in Figure 1, the system includes first and second processors which are linked by a data channel. Each processor includes a respective memory. The second memory (i.e., the memory of the second processor) includes operating code of a second operating system. The method includes storing a driver in the first memory, uploading a copy of the operating code from the second memory to the first memory, and testing the driver for incompatibility with the operating code to produce a reinforced operating code in the first memory. A copy of the reconfigured operating code is then downloaded to the second memory and executed by the second processor in place of the original operating code.

In Chatterji, the drivers are not individually passed between the processors. Instead, the operating code is loaded into the second memory, made compatible with a new driver, and then returned to the second memory for execution. Chatterji's approach is inefficient because it requires the entire operating system to be passed from the second memory to the first memory and back again every time a new driver needs to be installed. In Chatterji, only one element which could be identified as a "component" (i.e., the operating code) is fetched. Accordingly, Chatterji does not teach or suggest fetching and installing data defining separate components of a processing application so that the components are isolated from each other. Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion in Chatterji of permitting operational interaction between the components of a processing application in accordance with defined interaction rules, for at least the reason that Chatterji does not describe a plurality of isolated components.

In regard to the limitations previously included in claim 9, the Office Action

argues that Chatterji describes the installation of multiple drivers (see column 4, lines 64-67). However, the Office Action provides no evidence for such a contention. The Office Action also does not consider whether Chatterji permits operational interaction between the components of a processing application in accordance with defined interaction rules; Applicant respectfully submits that Chatterji does not teach or suggest such a feature.

Additionally, Chatterji does not describe arranging and testing components to verify their authenticity and/or to verify the defined interaction rules. While Chatterji does describe testing drivers for compatibility with the operating code, such functionality does not constitute verification of authenticity. Furthermore, in the absence of any teaching or suggestion of interaction rules, there can be no teaching or suggestion in Chatterji of verifying such rules. The passage cited in the Office Action regarding claim 10 (which includes the feature of defined interaction rules) in fact makes no reference at all to interaction rules, and in any case it does not indicate that they should, or even could, be verified.

In the absence of any teaching or suggestion of the features discussed above, no possible combination of features from Parthasarathy and Chatterji could give rise to the subject matter of claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1, 3-8, 10-23, 28-40, and 43-45 are patentable over the cited references. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Section 103(a) rejections.

CONCLUSION

Applicant asserts that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the present response is believed to be a complete response to the issues raised in the Office Action and full reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions, comments, or suggestions, the undersigned attorney earnestly requests a telephone conference. If any petitions for extensions of time are required or fees are due, said petitions for extensions of time are hereby requested and the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1505/6000-16500/BNK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 33,929

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Fax: (512) 853-8801
Date: 3-3-05